THE PRINTING AND THE PRINTERS OF *THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER*, 1549–1561

Bibliographers have been notoriously 'hesitant to deal with liturgies', and this volume bridges an important gap with its authoritative examination of how *The Book of Common Prayer* came into being. The first edition of 1549, the first Grafton edition of 1552 and the first quarto edition of 1559 are now correctly identified, while Peter Blayney shows that the first two editions of 1559 were probably finished on the same day. Through relentless scrutiny of the evidence, he reveals that the contents of the 1549 version continued to evolve both during and after the printing of the first edition, and that changes were still being made to the Elizabethan revision weeks after the Act of Uniformity was passed. His bold reconstruction is transformative for the early Anglican liturgy, and thus for the wider history of the Church of England. This major, revisionist work is a remarkable book about a remarkable book.

PETER W. M. BLAYNEY is an independent scholar widely considered to be the leading expert on the book trade in Tudor and early Stuart London. His publications include *The Texts of King Lear and their Origins* (1982), which reconstructed the printing of the First Quarto in unprecedented detail; his ground-breaking monograph, *The Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard* (1990), which pioneered the field of book-trade topography; and *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557* (2013), one of the most important contributions to the history of the book trade and printing for several generations. He has been awarded fellowships by Trinity College, Cambridge, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the Bibliographical Society.

THE PRINTING AND THE PRINTERS OF *THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER*, 1549–1561

PETER W. M. BLAYNEY

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108837415
DOI: 10.1017/9781108939713

First published 2022

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ Books Limited, Padstow Cornwa

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
NAMES: Blayney, Peter W. M., 1944– author.
TITLE: The printing and the printers of the Book of common prayer, 1549–1561 / Peter W.M. Blayney.
DESCRIPTION: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY, USA : Cambridge University Press, 2022. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2021024760 (print) | LCCN 2021024761 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108837415 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108940597 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108939713 (ebook)
SUBJECTS: LCSH: Church of England. Book of common prayer. | Church of England – Publishing. | Printing – England – History – 16th century. | BISAC: LANGUAGE ARTS & DISCIPLINES / Publishers & Publishing Industry
CLASSIFICATION: LCC BX5145 .B59 2022 (print) | LCC BX5145 (ebook) | DDC 264/.03–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021024760
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021024761

ISBN 978-1-108-83741-5 Hardback

To the memory of Elizabeth A. ('Betsy') Walsh:
for 35 years one of the great treasures of
the Folger Shakespeare Library

Contents

A colour plate section will be found between pages 164 and 165.

Figures and Plates

Plates (after p. 164)

Preface: The Archaeology of a Printed Book

This book began as a detailed investigation into both how and why a surprisingly large number of printers collaborated on transforming the second Edwardian prayer book of 1552 into the Elizabethan *Book of Common Prayer* – a process that was not really completed until the end of 1561.

More than twenty years ago at the British Library I first opened one of the two earliest folio editions of the 1559 version, whose imprint names Elizabeth's two Queen's Printers, Richard Jugge and John Cawood. I was already aware that they were not partners in a single business and that each ran his own independent printing house, so I wanted to know which part or parts of the book each had printed. What I found, however, was so extraordinary and unexpected that far more time would be needed to unravel its complexity – especially since I was already working on a large and time-consuming project. After a brief look at the Library's other 1559 editions, therefore, I arranged to have all six of them microfilmed so that I could excavate them at leisure.

I cannot claim to be a liturgiologist, and the Elizabethan Settlement is a topic that has preoccupied many historians and scholars far more expert in the relevant disciplines than I am. But what has made me step into this dauntingly crowded arena is that the prayer books of 1559 have never been examined really closely by analytical bibliographers. Never before has anyone realized how extraordinary the editions of that year are as printed books. It was not possible to limit the study to the single edition that first drew my attention. To begin with, two substantially different editions were printed soon after Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity prescribed what the book should contain, and the relationship between them (not limited to the question of which came first) needed clarification. Each was a reprint, with most of the required revisions, of an edition of the second Edwardian prayer book, and the reasons why those 1552 editions were themselves so differently structured needed to be explained. And when that investigation

led back to the first Edwardian prayer books of 1549, examining the seemingly settled question of which of *those* editions was the first to be printed and published opened a new can of worms.

Many years ago, in an essay on the revised *Short-Title Catalogue*, I drew attention to some examples of the wry wit of Katharine F. Pantzer, including her memorable note that 'Most bibliographers are hesitant to deal with liturgies from the period before, during, and after the Reformation' – which of course means all liturgies, past, present, and future.[A] I must confess that I had long been a member of the hesitant majority in this (dis)regard, because none of the printers who most interested me were known to have printed liturgies. The category 'liturgical books' is therefore one that I had usually been content to leave to those more interested in the liturgy itself.

But at the same time I have long accepted what many now consider to be an obsolete definition of *bibliography*, namely the study of books as material objects without regard to their contents. As a bibliographer in that sense, I am most interested in books that tell stories. Not books *of* stories, but material objects that tell their own stories: books that contain evidence of one kind or another that their progress through the printing house may have been neither routine nor regular. Rather than 'The History of the Book' (whatever 'the Book' may mean in the capitalized singular) – or the history of *a* book, or of books collectively – I have always thought of what I do as more akin to the archaeology of books.

Since the early 1970s I have made something of a speciality of identifying the printers of books printed anonymously in England, and, in particular, of determining whether a book was printed throughout by a single printer, or whether one or more parts of it were printed by one or more others (as is not uncommon in and after Elizabeth's reign). This is a field of study that is not exactly crowded, and while three of the revisers of the *Short-Title Catalogue* were very good at it, the sheer magnitude of their task did not allow them to devote as much time to individual Edwardian or Elizabethan liturgies as their unsuspected complexity required. So although the contents of the prayer books of 1549–59 have been minutely examined and copiously discussed over the centuries by numerous scholars whose learning I cannot hope to emulate, they have hardly ever been closely scrutinized by any expert in the kind of detective work in which I specialize. Nobody, for example, has noticed (or, at least, mentioned) that one sheet in the first of Edward Whitchurch's editions of March 1549 was printed by Nicholas

[A] Blayney, 'The Numbers Game', 381, citing STC, 11, 68, col. 2.

Hill, who also contributed more extensively to three of Whitchurch's next four editions. Nobody seems to have observed (in either sense) that in the same year Robert Wyer printed parts of three 'Grafton' editions, that in 1552 Steven Mierdman printed parts of two 'Whitchurch' editions, or that one 'Grafton' edition of that year includes sheets from both Nicholas Hill and John Day. Nor, indeed, has it even been realized that the edition listed by STC as Grafton's last of 1552 is in fact his first of that year.[A]

When I focused on 1559, however, I discovered that the first 'Jugge and Cawood' folio edition of *The Book of Common Prayer* (STC 16292) was the collaborative work of a completely unprecedented number of printers – several of whom subsequently also worked on both the third and fourth editions. Meanwhile all known copies of the rival first edition (printed mostly by Richard Grafton but partly by one of his former apprentices) contain one or more sheets (in two cases more than twenty) recycled from the last 'Grafton' edition of 1552. The folios were followed by two quarto editions, of which at least the first is the work of four printers, and not until one of the last editions of the year (an octavo) do we find one certifiably printed by a single printer from beginning to end (although he was neither of the two men named in both the imprint and the colophon).

I reported an early version of those parts of this study as the twenty-fourth George Kiddell Memorial Lecture, given in 2018 at the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto, under the title 'How Many Printers Does It Take to Change a Liturgy?'. Later that year I gave a substantially revised version at the Annual General Meeting of the Friends of Lambeth Palace Library, and rewrote it as 'Printing the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer*: Events Without Precedent' in the *Lambeth Palace Library Annual Review 2018*, pp. 106–34. And more recently I reported some of the conclusions reached in the present Chapter 1 to *New College Notes* as 'The First Issue of the First Edition of the First Edwardian Prayer Book: New College Library, Oxford, BT1.131.19'.

Unlike those papers, this book does not always travel in a straight line towards a single conclusion. Its principal focus remains the first two 1559 editions of *The Book of Common Prayer*. But the physical form of those books had already been essentially determined by the reprinting history of the editions of 1552, which in turn owed much to lessons learned by their printers in 1549. The first three chapters are therefore essentially

[A] David N. Griffiths, whose *Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer* was published in 2002, apparently relied almost exclusively on the revised STC for all editions before 1641. All STC's errors about the Tudor editions are reproduced, augmented by additional errors of Griffiths's own.

introductory, but each in a different way. After a brief sketch of the historical background from Henry VIII's break with Rome to the accession of Edward VI, Chapter 1 offers a radically revised history of the earliest editions of the 1549 *Book of the Common Prayer*, and attempts to explain why each of the printers changed the structure of his later editions in different ways. Chapter 2 outlines the similarly varied reprinting histories of the replacement book of 1552, which explain why the physical structures of the two first editions of the Elizabethan book are so different. And Chapter 3 outlines the difficulties in which the reign of Mary Tudor left the London printing trade, and describes how Elizabeth's first parliament made it possible for the 1552 liturgy to be both revived and revised.

The text of the 1559 book would shape the religion of a nation for centuries, but those who printed it were not the men who wrote it. As this study will show again and again, the process of printing a book could be unpredictably complicated, and sometimes seemingly irrational. The London book trade of 1559 was no longer what it had been under Edward VI – and even then it had been more remarkable for energy and commitment than for high-quality workmanship. Mary's reign had seriously compromised the productivity of one of the houses that had printed the Edwardian prayer books, and had imposed conditions that led to the closure of the other. Elizabeth's first Queen's Printer had never before been a printer, had no printing house, and took several months to find and equip one. She therefore appointed a partner for him: *Mary's* Queen's Printer, who had himself never been a printer until Mary chose him, and had owed his royal appointment to his Catholic faith.

Of those who worked on the 1559 books, four were men who (under the terms of the charter that Mary had granted the Stationers' Company in 1557) had no legal right to print at all because they were not Stationers. Two of the Stationers who worked on the folio editions of 1559 had barely four years' experience as master printers, and one of them had recently been in trouble for his involvement (together with one of the four non-Stationers) in the carelessly printed piracy of a book of sermons by one of Mary's bishops. These were among the men who, at or soon after the end of April 1559, were given the impossible task of supplying every parish in England with enough books to allow the new service to be introduced on 24 June, when it was supposed to become compulsory. And among the additional difficulties was that even after the printing began, further revisions to the 1552 service book were still being devised by the authorities (though no longer with parliamentary sanction).

Chapters 4–7 focus on the first two folio editions of 1559. They depend, however, on the interpretation of a variety of kinds of evidence, some of which will be unfamiliar to many readers, and cannot easily be presented in strict order, either chronological or bibliographical. One of those editions reprinted (with the necessary revisions) a Grafton edition of 1552, while the other likewise reprinted a Whitchurch edition. It has been implausibly suggested that the Grafton example (which accurately quotes the Act of Supremacy and reprints the Act of Uniformity verbatim) had been finished before Parliament assembled on 23 January. In reality there is reason to believe that the other edition, printed in the names of the Queen's Printers, was the first to be started. But the preliminaries show clear signs of cooperation between the two teams of printers, and there is evidence strongly suggesting that the rival title-pages were printed on the same day.

Although the Jugge and Cawood edition was probably started first, in Chapter 4 I begin with the main text of the Grafton edition. I do so partly because the question of its date needs to be cleared up, and partly because the most obvious bibliographical complication of that edition is fairly simple to describe and explain – but chiefly because the edition by the Queen's Printers is the principal ancestor of all subsequent editions. Chapter 5 then focuses on the distinctly more complicated progress of the main text in that edition. In Chapter 6, however, the partly collaborative preliminaries of both editions (the first quires in the books but the last to be printed) are examined side by side. Chronology is then violated again when Chapter 7 considers the ordinal that each team had printed before they turned to the preliminaries – and also before they were informed that it was not to be included after all, but marketed separately (or in one case perhaps suppressed).

The next two chapters examine the subsequent editions of the same year. Chapter 8 looks at the two folio reprints (each shared by five of the former printers but not divided in quite the same way); Chapter 9 examines the two known editions in quarto (one with an appended psalter that reveals an unexpected conflict between royal patents) and the two known octavos (one of which survives only as a fragment whose precise location is at present unknown).

The lengthy Chapter 10 examines the second stage of the Elizabethan revision. In 1561 the queen commanded that changes be made to the liturgical calendar, claiming that some of the prescribed Old Testament readings in the lectionary could usefully be replaced by more edifying ones. The lectionary did need attention, but the real problems were consequences of the 1559 revision of the table of proper lessons – and what the

reforms of 1561 actually accomplished fell far short of what Elizabeth intended. Editions printed in and after 1562 with the new calendar are no concern of this study, but many of the several thousand owners of 1559 folio editions (most of them clergy) urgently needed the new information. So Richard Jugge was given the task of printing cancel calendars to be inserted into copies from which the obsolete leaves had been removed. The most important changes were in the lectionary columns, but the most noticeable were a substantially increased number of saints' days, feasts, and fasts added to the column once reserved only for red-letter holy days. At first sight these additions could suggest a revival of Catholic traditions, but investigation shows that more than three-quarters of them had also been anticipated in 1552–53 by the unquestionably Protestant Whitchurch and Grafton in their small-format editions, and that others could be found in the calendars of Edwardian bibles and New Testaments, seemingly added at the discretion and choice of their printers. Not until 1562 was a complete edition of the Elizabethan book printed (in quarto) that actually incorporated the changes of 1561, and can claim to be the first fully revised edition of *The Book of Common Prayer* as it would endure throughout Elizabeth's reign until revised again under James I.

It seems likely that some readers (perhaps many) would prefer to find out where the journey is going before choosing to focus on the many and varied steps along the way. Chapter 11 therefore attempts to summarize the whole story, from the first Edwardian edition to Elizabeth's cancel calendars, as a single narrative.

Acknowledgements

Most of those who have materially helped with the research for this book are on the staff of libraries or archives holding one or more of the early books mentioned in it. One of the most significantly valuable events in that respect was the acquisition in 2017, by the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto, of what thus became the only 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* in Canada (bound with one of the only two copies of the 1559 ordinal outside England), for which I am deeply grateful in alphabetical order to Pearce Carefoote (Head of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections), Loryl MacDonald (Director), and Philip Oldfield (retired librarian).

The following list is alphabetical by library or archive, where I have particular reasons to be grateful to the following: at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Jo Maddocks, Dunja Sharif, and Sarah Wheale); Boston Public Library (Jay Moschella); Brasenose College, Oxford (Liz Kay); British Library (Karen Limper-Herz and Christian Algar); Cambridge University Library (William Hale); Christ Church, Oxford (David Stumpp and Gabriel Sewell); Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Alexander Devine); Corpus Christi College, Oxford (Joanna Snelling and Julie Blyth); Durham Cathedral Library (Gary Butler and Sarah-Jane Raymond); Eton College Library (Lucy Gwynn); General Theological Seminary, New York (Patrick Cates); Houghton Library, Harvard (Leslie A. Morris and William P. Stoneman); Huntington Library (Steven Tabor); Jesus College, Oxford (Owen McKnight); Keble College, Oxford (Yvonne Murphy); Lambeth Palace Library (Giles Mandelbrote, Ken Gibb, and Hugh Cahill); Lincoln Cathedral Library (Claire Arrand); Lincoln's Inn (Dunstan Speght); The Morgan Library & Museum (John Bidwell); New College, Oxford (Christopher Skelton-Foord, William Poole, and Anna-Nadine Pike); Oxford University Press Archives (Martin Maw); Pembroke College, Cambridge (Pat Aske); St John's College, Cambridge (Kathryn McKee); Westminster Abbey (Matthew Payne); and York Minster (Steven Newman).

In addition, a very special thanks to Sophie Floate for taking the photographs used in Figures 1 and 2.

Stephen Tabor has also earned my gratitude as one of two sources of information about (and recipients of criticisms of) entries in the ESTC; the other (to whom I am equally grateful) being John Lancaster. Ben Higgins deserves particular thanks for examining and photographing books in Oxford for me, and for going above and beyond when reporting on them in detail, while Simon Healy's expertise in matters parliamentary saved me from a couple of embarrassing oversights.

Despite being a practitioner of bibliography 'without regard to [a book's] contents', I have sometimes needed to ask questions about the text itself and to discuss its historical context. I thank both Paul Edmondson and Diarmaid MacCulloch for having responded to uninvited questions, and Pearce Carefoote for always being willing to answer others. My principal gratitude in this respect, however, is owed to Brian Cummings. In 2007 I was able to give him some (now partly obsolete) information about the 1559 books, since when I have often turned to him with questions about their contents. It was he who suggested that I expand my fairly cursory discussion of the 1549 editions, not realizing where that would lead. And once it had led there, G. Thomas Tanselle kindly agreed to read an early version of the result, and offered some valuable criticisms. Meanwhile, for advice and answers of many kinds, I must as usual thank my fellow-student in 1970 (and friend ever since), David McKitterick.

I am also grateful to Brian Cummings and Henry Woudhuysen for reading my original typescript for the Press in 2019. Their valuable suggestions led to very extensive revision, and if I occasionally chose not to follow a suggested additional path it was not because I doubted the potential value of doing so. My gratitude is also due to those at Cambridge University Press who patiently awaited the final revisions and pandemic-delayed illustrations (Emily Hockley and George Laver), and to Bethany Johnson and copy-editor Deborah Hey for making the endgame far less stressful than it could have been.

During the years when I wrestled with the printer-identifications, revising them, and constantly correcting the details – when I was wondering if, when, and how this could ever become a coherent book – my wife Leslie Thomson must often have wished that she had never heard the terms *BCP* and *lectionary*. But once I started writing in earnest she patiently read my drafts and always steered them (and me) towards greater clarity. It may be a long time before either of us can look casually at a calendar again, but without her this book would not exist.

Permissions

I should like to express my gratitude for the permission that has been granted for the reproduction of the illustrations here listed, by and for the following:

Boston Public Library: Figure 6*a*.
Bridwell Library Special Collections, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University: Figure 26.
The British Library Board: Figures 5*a–e*, 6*b*, 8*a–d*, 9*d–f*, 10, 18, 20*h*, 21*a*, 21*c–d*, 23*a–b*, 27, 28, and Plates 3, 5, and 8.
Cambridge University Library: Figure 22.
The Chapter of York: Figures 7, 14, 21*b*, 21*f*, and Plate 6.
The Folger Shakespeare Library: Figure 20*g*.
Lambeth Palace Library: Cover image, Figures 3, 4, 9*a–c*, 11, 20*b*, 20*f*, 20*i*, and Plate 7.
The Master and Fellows of St John's College, Cambridge: Plate 4.
The Parliamentary Archives: Plate 1.
The Morgan Library & Museum, New York: Figure 24.
The President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford: Figures 12, 13, and Plate 2.
The Principal and Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford: Figure 17.
The Principal and Fellows of Brasenose College, Oxford: Figures 1–2.
The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto: Figures 15, 16, 19, 20*d–e*, and 21e.
The Warden, Fellows, and Scholars of Keble College, Oxford: Figure 20*a* and c.

Conventions

Bibliographical References

Readers unfamiliar with the conventions used by bibliographers when citing the pages of early printed books will find them simpler than they may seem at first sight, and Chapter 1 includes a brief introduction to the way in which books in folio were printed and to the accepted way of referring to the quires, leaves, and pages in them. The following notes add a few details not covered there.

Two books discussed in Chapter 9 were printed in quarto, which means that each sheet of paper was folded twice to make four leaves half the size of those of a folio (joined in pairs at the top, and needing to be cut open). To be more precise, each edition is a 'quarto in eights', in which each quire contains two sheets quired together (the outer sheet forms leaves 1–2 and 7–8; the inner sheet leaves 3–6). The last two editions of 1559 were in octavo, each sheet having been folded three times to make eight leaves half the size of those of a quarto. But in each case the printer's way of signing the first few leaves of each quire, and the way of referring to quire, leaf, and page, is exactly the same as for folios.

References are made in roman letters and arabic numerals, no matter what kind of type or numerals are used in the originals. Virtually all the signatures in the prayer books discussed here are in textura (blackletter, or 'gothic'), but although the ninth textura capital resembles a roman J rather than an I, and the twentieth looks more like a roman U than a V, their roman equivalents are I and V rather than J or U. For unstated reasons, while the revisers of the *Short-Title Catalogue* followed the accepted usage with textura I, when referring to quires signed with textura V they printed it as U. That practice has become common, but is not followed here.

When teaching literary students how to refer to the pages of early printed books, McKerrow explained that 'When the signature of a leaf consists of two or more similar letters, as BB, bbb, &c. (not Bb), it is usual and

convenient to give these as 2B, 3b, &c'.[A] Usual it may have been, but it is difficult to argue seriously that 2B is substantially more convenient than BB, and while it may be fractionally easier to write two characters (3b) than three (bbb), the claim of convenience really only applies to higher numbers. But at least McKerrow made no pretence that Bb – two *dissimilar* letters – was in any way analogous. Six years later, however, Greg showed less common sense in addressing what he called the 'slight complication' of books whose signatures exceed a single alphabet. The italics are mine.

> If the signatures are in lower case, a becomes aa and aaa, &c. and all is straightforward. But when an upper-case alphabet is doubled, A may become either AA or Aa – usually the latter. It is possible that printers occasionally distinguished between AA and Aa; *but if so the instances are too few to deserve recognition, and in practice we ignore them*. This enables us to write 2a in place of aa, and 2A in place either of AA or of Aa. The convention is important, since, if our formulas are to be manageable and our references convenient, we must endeavour to avoid such clumsy terms as $Aaaaaaa^4$ ($=7A^4$) or $DDDDDD7^v$ ($=6D7^v$) which would otherwise occur.[B]

Here Greg inserted a footnote to the effect that 'I am assured by my incunabulist friends that in the fifteenth century printers did, sometimes at any rate, distinguish between AA and Aa, using both in the same book', but defended his practice by declaring himself willing to 'go a long way to avoid unwieldy terms' – though evidently not an inch to avoid ambiguity. Twenty-five years later he appeared to have forgotten his 'incunabulist friends', and baldly asserted that 'the alternative forms [*that is, AA and Aa, etc.*] are never, so far as I am aware, used for purposes of differentiation and therefore need not be distinguished'.[C] A decade earlier, in fact, Fredson Bowers had rather reluctantly allowed the possibility of making an exception for doubled letters (though not for triples), saying that 'There can be no absolute objection to this partial expansion [*more accurately a refusal to contract*] . . . but in Greg's view it is illogical'.[D] He was mistaken: Greg's 'rule' was based not on logic but aesthetics.

Although an aversion to clumsiness could reasonably support a convention of condensing signatures either containing or exceeding *four* letters, to pretend that there is never a need to distinguish AAA from AAa or Aaa (all of which can be found in sixteenth-century

[A] McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography*, 161. [B] Greg, 'A Formulary of Collation', 373.
[C] Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, iv, clii. But STC 11275, printed in 1598 by Thomas Creede (a year and a printer Greg knew well), collates 2^o: $A–Z^6$ $AA–CC^6$ $Aa–Aaa^6$ Bbb^4.
[D] Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, 205–6. On pp. 457–8, however, he appears to accept 'Long form' formulae as an allowable alternative to his preferred 'Shorthand' versions.

London outside Greg's comparatively narrow literary focus) is myopic and perverse. Clumsiness cannot always be avoided when writing collations for bibles, chronicles, dictionaries, collected statutes, or editions of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. But Greg never had to wonder whether a quotation from '3A2^{r}' in Foxe's 1563 edition was on AAa2^{r} or 264 pages away on AAA2^{r}.

In this book, no signatures are condensed, and I shall note in Chapter 1 that a false distinction between the collations of the first and second Grafton prayer books of 1549 was a direct consequence of Greg's ambiguous convention.

In another departure from standard practice, I indicate conjugacy with a colon. In references to leaves that are not conjugate, their numbers are separated by commas, as in 'leaves A5,6 and P2,3,5,8'. But if two of them are conjugate, convention separates them with a period, as in 'A4.5 and M2,4.7,9'. To my mind, the difference between conjugate and separate is bigger than the tiny quantity of ink that makes a comma bigger than a period. Moreover, a period separates wholes; a colon joins parts into a whole. And because what lies between conjugate leaves is a vertical fold perforated with stitching, the colons I prefer in 'A4:5' and 'M2,4:7,9' can also claim to be illustrative.

Transcription

When transcribing printed text I here use roman and ignore long s and ligatures, although I do not modernize spelling or punctuation. When transcribing from manuscript I expand most contractions by supplying missing letters in italic, but otherwise follow the original as closely as feasible.

Dating

All dates follow the calendar year, with the numbered year beginning on New Year's Day (a name that was never applied to any day other than 1 January). The liturgical year likewise begins with the Feast of Circumcision (1 January), so even though the Year of the Incarnation was considered to begin on 25 March, liturgical almanacks and calendars typically identified a year by the number of the Year of Grace that began *during* it. (The very different distinction between Old Style and New Style did not exist before the Gregorian reforms of 1582.)

STC and ESTC

In volume 2 of the revised STC (1976), the twelve 'known' editions and issues of *The Book of the Common Prayer* dated 1549 are catalogued under the numbers 16267–76.[A] The order is determined by a combination of assumed chronology, the printer named on the title-page, and the format (2° precedes 4°). The series is in the 16000s because the books are in the alphabetical class 'Liturgies' (15791–16607) and sub-class 'Church of England' (16267–16559). In the online ESTC, the same twelve records in the same order are as follows: S109513, S93744, S113625, S93745, S113633, S112894, S108244, S112062, S112066, S93746, S121500, S93747.[B] In each case the 'S' identifies them as belonging to the STC period (1475–1640), but the numbers are determined not by any fact about the authorship, content, date, or format of the books themselves, but by when and where the online record was created.

Neither reference work at present includes an entry for either of the first two issues of the first edition, and neither recognizes that what are listed as mere reissues of two later editions are in fact distinct editions. Eventually, ESTC will presumably emend several of the existing records and add at least two new ones. Any STC entry here described as erroneous will always be there to be examined, but what I write today about an ESTC record may no longer be either true or verifiable if (or when) that record is emended or cancelled.

With a few exceptions in Appendix D, therefore, I have not used ESTC numbers in this study. The relevant records can all be found in an advanced search of ESTC by entering 'STC', a space, and the STC number in the 'Citation note' field.

Footnotes

Because there are so many references to one or more of the quires in numerous books, and because each quire is identified with a superior number denoting how many leaves it contains, to reduce the chances of confusion I have used capital letters to identify footnotes.

[A] Only ten numbers, but the series includes 16269.5 and 16270a.
[B] That is (in numerical order without the 'S'): 93744–7, 108244, 109513, 112062, 112066, 113625, 113633, 121500, and 122894.

Abbreviations

Book-titles whose abbreviations also serve as elements of standard reference numbers (DMH, STC, TRP) are here abbreviated in roman rather than italic. Place of publication is London unless otherwise specified.

APC	*Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. A.D. 1542–1558*. Ed. John Roche Dasent. 6 vols. 1890–93.
Arber	Edward Arber, ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A.D.* 5 vols. 1875–7, Birmingham 1894.
BCP	*Book of (the) Common Prayer*
BL	British Library.
CJ	*Journals of the House of Commons. From November the 8th 1547 . . . to March the 2d 1628*. 1802.
cm	centimetre(s).
col.	column.
ed.	edition, edited by.
EEBO	Early English Books Online (https://search.proquest.com/eebo).
ESTC	English Short-Title Catalogue (http://estc.bl.uk).
Graf.1	STC 16286.5 (ESTC S93760).
Graf.2a	STC 16285 (ESTC S93754).
Graf.2b	STC 16285.5 (ESTC S93755).
Graf.3	STC 16285.7 (ESTC S93756).
Graf.4	STC 16285a (ESTC S93757).
Graf.5	STC 16286 (ESTC S93758).
Graf.6a	STC 16286.2 (ESTC S93759).
Graf.6b	STC 16286.3 (ESTC S122910).
JC1	STC 16292 (ESTC S111841).
JC2	'STC 16292+'.
JC3	STC 16292a (ESTC S93764).

LJ	*Journals of the House of Lords, Beginning Anno Primo Henrici Octavi*. Vol. I: 1509–1577. 1846.
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives.
McKerrow	Ronald B. McKerrow. *Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland, 1485–1640*. 1913.
McK & F	Ronald B. McKerrow and F. S. Ferguson. *Title-Page Borders Used in England & Scotland, 1485–1640*. 1932.
m(m).	membrane(s).
mm	millimetre(s).
n(n).	note(s).
OED	*The Oxford English Dictionary*. Second edition, prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner. 20 vols. Oxford, 1989.
p(p).	page(s).
PArch.	Parliamentary Archives (formerly House of Lords Record Office).
PBSA	*Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*.
r	recto.
Stationers and Printers	Peter W. M. Blayney. *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 2013.
Statutes	*Statutes of the Realm*. Volume IV, part I (1547–1585). 1819.
STC	*A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*. Compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave. Second edition, revised by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer. 3 vols. 1976–91.
TNA: PRO	The National Archives: Public Record Office.
TRP	*Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin. 3 vols. New Haven, 1964–69.
UMI	University Microfilms International.
Whit.1a	STC 16279 (ESTC S93749).
Whit.1b	STC 16280–80.5 (ESTC S93750, S93751).
Whit.2	STC 16281 (ESTC S93752).
Whit.3	STC 16281.5 (ESTC S123430).
Whit.4	STC 16282.3 (ESTC S123381).
Whit.5	STC 16282.7 (ESTC S93753).
v	verso.

Wing — Wing, Donald, ed. *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641–1700*. Second edition, revised and edited by Timothy J. Crist, John J. Morrison, Carolyn W. Nelson, and Matthew Seccombe. 4 vols. New York, 1982–89.